

March 10, 1965

social security the country is stuck with it permanently. And, based on past experience, costs and taxes will soar as succeeding politically minded Congresses broaden the base of coverage until we have total federalized medicine, which other countries have found to be their most costly welfare tax. This should concern everyone, regardless of politics.

This whole matter is approaching a show-down and it deserves the commonsense attention of the people.

We Should Ratify the Genocide Convention—Article by Senator Scott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which urges ratification of the Genocide Convention. I wrote the article for the current issue of American Judaism.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR MORAL FAILURE: THIS NATION'S SPIRITUAL LEADERS MUST URGE RATIFICATION OF THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

(By Senator HUGH SCOTT, U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania)

In an age when humanity cries out for social justice and compassion for the weak, when the brutality of the Nazi regime stands before the West German bar and world opinion, it is ironic that our Government has failed to ratify the Genocide Convention.

How bitter is the irony when one knows the vital role the U.S. Government played in the drafting of the document 18 years ago, a government that stands for the rule of law in international relations, and now stands aloof.

The term "genocide" was coined by the late, brilliant, Prof. Raphael Lemkin, noted international law scholar. It was compounded from the Greek "genos," meaning race or tribe, and the Latin-derived "cide," signifying killing.

Genocide could be carried out in two ways:

1. Physical and mental: Subjecting people to conditions which lead to death of mutilation, e.g., putting people in concentration camps, placing them under slave labor conditions, or subjecting them to harmful drugs.

2. Biological: Prevention of reproduction through sterilization, compulsory abortion, and similar violent means. The stealing of children is included. These methods, which serve to destroy by delayed action, are as effective as outright murder.

In essence, the Genocide Convention will achieve the following: The nation in which the crime takes place is obliged to try the offender. The government will have enacted legislation to prevent and punish the crime. The acts punishable under the convention are genocide, conspiracy to commit genocide, attempt to commit genocide, complicity in genocide, direct and public incitement to commit genocide.

What is more, the convention provides that all guilty individuals are punishable, even if they happen to be public officers or heads of state.

While there is no international penal court and genocidists can be tried only in the country where the crime is committed, the convention does suggest the possibility of a new international court being set up in the future, which would have direct jurisdiction over genocidal acts. However, a separate treaty would be required to establish such a court and to determine the scope of its authority.

Former Assistant Secretary of State Ernest A. Gross, standing before the United Nations General Assembly on December 9, 1949, remarked:

"It seems to the U.S. delegation that, in a world beset by many problems and great difficulties, we should proceed with this convention before the memory of horrifying genocidal acts (the Nazi regime) has faded from the minds and conscience of man. Positive action must be taken now. My government is eager to see a Genocide Convention adopted at this convention of the Assembly and signed by all member states before we quit our labors here."

For the first time since the dawn of history, the criminal nature of genocide—the destruction of nations, races, ethnic groups, and religious bodies—was deemed a legal crime. The Genocide Convention established an essential principle of contemporary civilization.

The United States was among the first 20 countries to sign the document, only 2 days after its adoption. It remained for the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate present and voting for ratification. But advice and consent are still buried in committee.

Sixty-six nations have ratified the convention, including the Soviet Government.

And 16 years later, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has not reported the Genocide Convention out of committee. It still languishes, and this failure has exposed the United States to Communist allegations of insincerity, embarrassed our friends abroad and has seriously weakened the convention's effectiveness as an international instrument.

The vital question is posed: Why the failure of the United States to act on a humanitarian principle despite the all-embracing support and constant pleas by more than 50 major American Jewish organizations, labor, education, civic, and from the leaders of the 3 major faiths?

Why this failure to act when time and again we have risen, and through the force of arms, have thwarted despots and tyrants? Why? When an enlightened United States knows that through the millennia masses of innocent people have been destroyed because their only crime was being a member of some ethnic, racial, or religious group?

Some 20 million people have perished through genocide in the first half of this century—and we have still to put savagery behind us.

There are answers, pitiful in logic, which account for our failure to act. One can think of at least four general reasons.

There is the misconception in the minds of some that it might be applied to lynching. Lynching, of course, involves the murder of an individual as opposed to mass murder, and therefore genocide would not apply to it.

More realistically, the country's honeymoon with the United Nations was ending, and this meant that we tended to withdraw from any involvement in any further United Nations controversies.

The doctrine of States rights was also applied in opposition. That is, many were purported to believe that under our Federal system, approval of such a treaty might jeopardize or overrule a State law. Nothing could be more in error. One cannot imagine a State passing such law dealing with a crime that involved large masses.

Finally the argument was advanced that the Genocide Convention might result in

American citizens being brought for trial in foreign countries for crimes committed in the United States.

But article V of the Genocide Convention clearly states that ratifying nations will enact "in accordance with their respective constitutions," necessary legislation and "effective penalties."

Back in January of 1950, leaders of more than 50 organizations, representing millions of American citizens, appeared before a special genocide subcommittee under the chairmanship of the late Senator Brien McMahon of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, urging ratification.

The special subcommittee recommended ratification, urging the inclusion of four reservations. That was 1950, and ratification remains secluded in a dark recess.

Louis Schechter, of the American Jewish Congress, who has toiled valiantly and unceasingly for the ratification of the Genocide Convention, time and again has stressed that there was no chance for its approval unless the executive branch exercised its approval. Last July, I saw what seemed to be an opportunity for a final push. President Johnson let it be known that the White House wanted Senate ratification.

I enlisted the aid of 10 other Senators and wrote President Johnson asking for support in the matter, saying "It is generally recognized that only a strong appeal from the President will bring this measure to debate and a vote in the Senate."

The course of legislative-executive communication still runs in strange directions. Back came a reply—not from the President—but from Frederick Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, saying "It is the intention of the administration to ratify the Genocide Convention upon receiving the advice and consent of the Senate." Again "advice and consent."

Unquestionably, the President never saw the letter and this appeal for human lives was possibly given the same treatment as letters that request the President to accept a can of oil or to crown a beauty queen.

But more serious was the letter Senator Fulbright wrote Mr. Schechter, "It is my impression at the moment * * * that the situation in the Senate has not yet developed to a point where a two-thirds vote is likely. Under these circumstances there is serious doubt whether the national interest would be served by promoting a debate at this time which might lead to a defeat of the Genocide Convention on grounds quite extraneous to the subject matter."

Succinctly, Jessie Halpern, Washington correspondent of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, expressed the entire matter:

"Why, then, should the White House suddenly appear as a partner in 'buckpassing' when appealed to for leadership in the convention ratification? One certainly must hope that the reasons are not tied with the need for Southern democratic support in the administration's forthcoming campaign, President Johnson has given his unequivocal support to the civil rights bill. This has, of course, called for the wrath of southern politicians. And it is many of these same politicians who are afraid that U.S. ratification of the Genocide Convention will make it applicable under domestic law to the civil rights issue. It is also significant that while Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Fulbright supports aspects of international cooperation, his record on domestic civil rights leaves much to be desired.

"Beyond the current White House-Senate confusion, remains a consideration of undoubtedly great importance. This is the question of active moral commitment by the United States to the ratification. Until the issue is stripped of its political implications and brought entirely into a realm of moral consideration, it appears that the U.S. rati-

A1084

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 10, 1965

fiction of the Genocide Convention will continue on its way into unhealthy oblivion."

Here, one notes the recent editorial in the New York Times:

"The Genocide Convention deserves approval. It does not take away any sovereignty; it does advance the principles of the United Nations and the United States. Most of all, it is a moral commitment to international decency on a matter that has immediacy for many people around the world. It would be a bitter irony if in 1964, when the Auschwitz killers are on trial, the United States permitted the Genocide Convention to fade into oblivion."

If ever the religious forces of our Nation were needed to exercise their influence on the White House—it is now. The Genocide Convention is needed not only as an act of humanitarianism but for the specific purpose of giving religious groups protection against tyrants—protection which they sorely needed but have not had in the past. Through the ages, religious groups have known unparalleled and uninterrupted persecution—the desecration, the destruction of their houses of prayer which strikes at the very roots of a civilized society.

The Nazi slaughter of 6 million Jewish men, women, and children is unique in history because of its magnitude, but through the centuries, tyrants, with varying degrees of success, have destroyed populations of innocent people.

In this century of turmoil, confusion, and cruelty, the world must be equipped with an international document. Only our ratification can justify our position of moral leadership in the world.

This Nation's spiritual leaders of all faiths must accelerate, to the point of justifiable demand, that the Genocide Convention be approved by the U.S. Senate. More than legal arguments are needed. There must be a voicing of conscience on this matter, from those who speak in the name of faith. And the tide of public opinion must be stirred to a swell.

Time to Retire, Mr. Congressman**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, a committee of six members in the eighth grade at Reynoldsburg Junior High School, Reynoldsburg, Ohio, submitted a suggestion relative to retirement of Members of the House and Senate.

This program is as follows:

**RETIREMENT OF U.S. SENATORS AND
REPRESENTATIVES**

The purpose of this plan is to better the ability of the U.S. Congress.

The retirement plan is as follows:

1. Senators must retire from the Senate at the age of 70 or at the end of five terms, whichever comes first, unless age 70 is acquired during a term in office. He must then retire from his tenure as a Senator at the end of that term.

2. Representatives must retire from the House at the age of 65, or at the end of that particular term if age is acquired at any time in that term.

3. We want to encourage the Members of the House of Representatives to move up to the Senate earlier than they do at present time.

4. We believe that Congress would be better able to serve the people with this plan. A younger Congress would react better to the growing pressures of today's Government.

5. A plan whereby retired Members of Congress may become honorary Members of their respective House. The retired Congressman shall be allowed to attend any session of Congress. They would have a voice in concerning affairs, but no vote. (These Congressmen are only ones who have retired from Congress because of this law, no other exceptions would be accepted.)

We hope these proposals will be carefully considered.

DAN HEISCHMAN,
President.

ELOISE WRIGHT,
Vice President.

MARSHA PASQUINE,
Secretary.

IAHRES ZORICH,
DALE HOSTINSKE,
JOHN F. McNAMARA,
L. A. MYERS,

Adviser.

Obviously, these young people have been doing some thinking, and their adviser, L. A. Myers, should be complimented for stimulating their interest in the operation of their Government, and qualifications of officeholders.

Manpower Retraining: Proposed Reduction of State Contributions**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the need for continued Federal support for manpower retraining is a matter of great interest and concern in my State. Unfortunately, there has been delay in the enactment by a number of States of appropriations required for their share of the cost assigned under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

In order to lessen the chances of endangering the existence of ongoing programs, Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, has introduced H.R. 5275, which proposes to reduce the proportionate amount which must be contributed by the State governments. The significance of this bill has been well stated by the South Bend Tribune, Mr. President; and I ask unanimous consent that its analysis be printed in the Appendix, and thus brought to the attention of Senators.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APATHY: A CASE HISTORY

A bill in the congressional hopper that would allow the Federal Government to continue picking up most of the tab for manpower retraining projects is, unfortunately, must legislation. And therein lies the tale of the current crisis in Federal-State relations.

In passing the original Manpower Development and Training Act, Congress tried manfully to cast the law in what has become the traditional American mold of Federal-

State coresponsibility: The Federal Government and the State governments were to share the cost after a short initial period when Washington would carry the full load to get the program going.

It quickly became clear that the States weren't going to pick up their share as quickly as Congress thought they should. So the period of full Federal underwriting for manpower training was extended, to give State legislatures time to pass participating legislation.

Still the States dragged their feet. And each day it became clearer that State governments, by and large, were apathetic toward the best tool yet devised for reducing unemployment.

Even in Indiana, where the earliest and most successful retraining projects were undertaken, it is requiring all the efforts a few St. Joseph County legislators can muster to convince the general assembly of the wisdom of participating in Manpower Development Training Act.

As the Federal law now stands, the States must start paying a third of the total costs of retraining after June 30. Fewer than 10 States are prepared to do that. Hence the new bill, introduced in the present Congress by Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, of South Bend, with the support of the Johnson administration: It would reduce the State's share from a third to a tenth of the cost, letting the Federal Government pick up 90 percent. (There is another move in the House of Representatives to make the Federal Government permanently responsible for 100 percent of the cost, but this lacks administration support.)

Even if the Brademas bill passes Congress in time to take effect before the June 30 deadline, it is still very much up in the air whether the Indiana General Assembly, already looking toward adjournment until January of 1967, will respond to the pleas of men like Senators Leonard Opperman and Donald Yeagley of South Bend, and pass a law providing any sort of State matching funds.

Incredibly, then, there is at least a possibility that manpower training projects in Indiana will have to phase out after June 30. For South Bend alone, that would mean snatching hope away from 600 jobless men and women who are participating in training projects that offer them their only chance of getting off relief.

Manpower training is a discouraging case history of State apathy—apathy that threatens a program under which 300,000 Americans have already been given new job skills to make them productive members of society and taxpayers.

**Our Military Mail Facility at Frankfurt,
Germany****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last summer while in Europe I made an official call on behalf of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to our military mail facility at Frankfurt, Germany. This facility is our primary distribution point for the entire European theater. It not only distributes personal mail to the members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, but it handles a tre-